

REMARKS

I. Status Of The Claims

Claims 24-65 are pending in this Application.

Claims 24-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aziz (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0154279).

Claims 24, 35, 44, 55, 64, and 65 are independent.

II. Rejection of Independent Claims 24, 35, 44, 55, 64, and 65

The Office Action rejects independent claims 24, 35, 44, 55, 64, and 65 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aziz.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Aziz fails, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“...selecting data, wherein selection takes into account the monitoring; and

sending the selected data over a multicast network”

as set forth in each of claims 24, 44, and 64 (emphasis added).

As another example, Aziz fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“...receiving, over a multicast network, selected data through a local proxy,

wherein selection of the data takes into account monitoring of the interaction network”

as set forth in each of claims 35, 55, and 65 (emphasis added).

The Office Action, equating the “reports” of Aziz with the “data” of the claims, contends that such is disclosed by paragraph [0113], paragraph [0204], and Table 8B of Aziz.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully submit that even if the “reports” of Aziz were taken to be the “data” of the claims for the sake of argument, Aziz would still fail, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest sending the reports over a multicast network or receiving, over a multicast network, the reports.

The Office Action points to the mention of the word “multicast” in Table 8B of Aziz. However, Applicants respectfully observe that, with respect to Table 8B, Aziz merely discusses that:

“[e]ach of the interface definitions within a firewall definition (out-interface, in-interface, and possibly fw-interface) comprises an interface value, zero or more allow values, and zero or more deny values. The interface value consists of a name of the interface. The allow value is a list of services to which access is allowed through the interface, and can contain zero or more service definitions. The in-interface is a list of denied services, and also can contain zero or more service definitions. Access to these services will be denied from this interface.

A service is defined by a sequence number value, name value, protocol value, port value, from value, and to value ... The name value provides the name of the service ... If the service name is a standard service as specified in Table 8B herein or is specified as ‘all,’ then a protocol value need not be provided ...

In the service definition for a firewall device, the name of the service may be either a standard service or a user-defined service. According to an example embodiment, standard services having the names set forth in Table 8B are defined” (see Aziz paragraphs [0187], [0188], and [0204]; emphasis added).

Applicants believe it clear that, even if the “reports” of Aziz were taken to be the “data” of the claims for the sake of argument, mere discussion by Aziz of Table 8b listing “standard services” to which the firewall can be configured to “allow” or “deny” “access” would

not at all be disclosure, teaching, or suggestion, for instance, that the reports of Aziz are sent or received over a multicast network.

Additionally, the Office Action equates the “monitoring” of Aziz with the “monitoring an interaction network” and the “monitoring of the interaction network” of the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree.

However, even if, for the sake of argument, the “reports” of Aziz were taken to be the “data” of the claims and the “monitoring” of Aziz were taken to be the “monitoring” of the claims, Applicants believe it clear that mere discussion by Aziz, as cited by the Office Action, that:

“[t]he reporting function may also enable customers to select the reports they want to access, and may provide the ability to specify dates or ranges of dates for reports to cover. The reporting functionality may also enable a user to schedule automated generation of reports, e.g. weekly/monthly traffic reports and weekly/monthly billing reports”
(see Aziz paragraph [0113])

would still not at all be, for instance, disclosure, teaching, or suggestion that, in selecting the reports that they want to access, the customers take into account monitoring.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24, 35, 44, 55, 64, and 65, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

III. Dependent Claim Rejections

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and

appropriate.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

V. Authorization

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4041.

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

By:



Angus R. Gill
Registration No. 51,133

Dated: October 19, 2006

Mailing Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)